

Shad Hallihan. They are public school teachers in the Joliet public school system. They just had a baby. They are celebrating the birth of a child. They suffer the marriage tax penalty because they are both in the workforce. And under our tax code this young couple who just had a baby, who is just starting their life together as a family, pays higher taxes just because they chose to get married.

Now, had they chose to live together outside of marriage they would not pay those higher taxes. I am proud to say the House and Senate passed legislation which will eliminate the marriage tax penalty for the majority of those who suffer it. It is a key part; it is an essential part of the Financial Freedom Act, legislation that will lower the tax burden as well as simplify the tax code and bring fairness to the tax code.

The question of the day is, Mr. President, are you going to join with us eliminating the marriage tax penalty to help hard-working, young Americans, actually Americans of every age, because seniors suffer the marriage tax penalty, but people like Michelle and Shad Hallihan who suffer the marriage tax penalty?

Our legislation eliminates the marriage tax penalty for a majority of those who suffer it. It should be a bipartisan effort. We ask the President to join with us, sign the tax cut, sign the Financial Freedom Act, and eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

INS REIMBURSEMENT TO GUAM AND COMPACT-IMPACT AID FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about a couple of issues that are vitally important to the people of Guam and as we face the prospect of trying to deal with the remaining appropriations measures and face the possibility of some protracted negotiations between the leaders of both the House and Senate and the Administration, and these two issues pertain to the reimbursement for costs that have been incurred in Guam as a result of unrestricted immigration as well as recent experience, in particular this year with the onset of the arrival of many illegal immigrants coming from the People's Republic of China.

Since the beginning of this year, Guam has been marked by some of the smugglers inside the People's Republic of China as the newest target for Chinese criminal organizations smuggling human cargo from the PRC.

In the past 4 months alone, Guam has been the recipient of more than 700 ille-

gal aliens seeking political asylum in the United States. These figures have already surpassed the total of 1998 of over 600. It is further suspected that many more undocumented arrivals have hit Guam that have not been counted.

As the U.S.'s westernmost border, Guam is perhaps the most attractive destination to enter the United States from the PRC. Guam is the closest American jurisdiction to China. The full application of the INA, the Immigration and Nationality Act, applies to Guam. Because of this, what has happened is that these people come to Guam and apply for some form of political asylum and then they are allowed to move on.

Through very protracted negotiations involving the White House and particularly the National Security Council, as well as INS officials, we have been able to slow down this process by using the Northern Marianas as the place where they could also be taken. Interestingly, in the Northern Marianas, the full weight of the INS does not apply so, as a consequence, they were more easily repatriated back to the PRC.

Guam is a very small place, only 212 small miles and a small population of 150,000. The real problem here for the people of Guam is that despite all of the guarantees of the Federal Government, the cost of housing these people has fallen on the Government of Guam. As a matter of fact, leading up until last month, the total cost is well over \$7 million this year alone. And there continues to be over 500 of these individuals remaining in Guam facilities, in Guam Department of Correction facilities; and the prospect is that they may be there another year or 2 years at the rate of approximately \$50,000 a day.

Now, we had hoped that this reimbursement would come through in the process of the appropriations as the administration has asked for that, but it has not come to pass.

Last week, however, our neighbors to the north, who have a much smaller bill presented to the Federal Government, the INS surprisingly announced that they were satisfying that bill from the Northern Marianas to the amount of \$750,000.

So today, certainly I call upon the INS to get moving on this issue to try to find the resources to reimburse the people of Guam and to reimburse the local coffers for this cost, which is not our doing and which was entered into as a result of good-faith negotiations between the Government of Guam and federal officials.

Secondarily, there is also the issue of compact-impact assistance. This is as a result of the unrestricted migration of citizens from the newly independent states, the so-called freely associated states, primarily the federated states of Micronesia.

This has been a continuing source of debate. There is a federal law which says that any social and educational costs as a result of this unrestricted migration, they are the only independent countries in the world that have no quotas, no visa requirements; they can freely migrate into any part of the United States, that as a result of any social or educational costs, the Federal Government will reimburse the territories.

Well, because Guam is near these areas, these people have gone to Guam and continue to utilize social and educational resources, which we estimate amount to anywhere between \$15 million and \$20 million a year.

As I speak today, in 1996, we were able to get an amendment to the Interior Appropriations Act to get a stream of roughly \$4.5 million to Guam every year since then. But we certainly look forward to balancing those books a little bit more.

The President's request put in \$10 million for the upcoming year. And certainly it is my hope that as we continue the process of vetting the appropriations measures that these two important items, obligations of the Federal Government will be met.

WHY WE NEED TO MAKE AED'S MORE AVAILABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to share with my colleagues why I believe passage of the cardiac arrest survival act is so important to this country.

If this bill becomes law, it would have the potential of saving thousands and thousands of lives each year. Passage of this act would go a long way towards making the goal of saving the lives of people who suffer sudden cardiac arrest possible. It would ensure that what the American Heart Association refers to as a "cardiac chain of survival" could go into effect.

While defibrillation, which is number three on the list, is the most effective mechanism to revive a heart that has stopped, it is also the least accessed tool we have available to treat victims suffering from heart failure.

Let me tell my colleagues about an experience about a Navy commander, John Hearing's experience. He is a cardiac arrest survivor. On October 9, 1997, stationed in Fallon, Nevada, Navy Commander John Hearing was swimming as part of a semi-annual physical readiness test when he suddenly felt ill. He went to the base clinic and collapsed inside, where Corpsmen immediately started CPR.

Although there was a hospital defibrillator available in the clinic, the

emergency medical technicians were not trained to use it. So, of course, they called for help. A doctor arrived and defibrillated him.

After 8 months of limited duty, he was cleared to return to active duty and is currently assigned to the Office of Secretary of Defense.

Commander Hearing's outcome could have been tragic if the doctor had not been available. If the doctor had not been available, the EMTs, who were not equipped with an automated external defibrillator, AED, would have likely watched Commander Hearing die.

Commander Hearing knows how lucky he is today. His experience stands in contrast to another incident at the Pentagon in March of 1998.

□ 1245

Army Colonel Mike Moake was exercising in the Pentagon Athletic Club early one morning when he experienced a sudden cardiac arrest. Paramedics were called, and bystanders performed CPR on Colonel Moake. Medics arrived more than 20 minutes after his collapse and defibrillated him. They started his heart, but by that time Colonel Moake had suffered irreversible brain damage. Unfortunately, he died 2 weeks later.

If an automated external defibrillator had been available in this case, Colonel Moake's chances of survival would have improved immeasurably. Partly as a result of Colonel Moake's tragic death, the Pentagon is procuring and installing several AEDs. After Commander Hearing's experience in Fallon, Nevada, the Navy procured AEDs for the clinic and ambulances at several other military bases.

The American Heart Association and American Red Cross objective is to advance legislation like the Cardiac Arrest Survival Act so others do not have to die or barely escape death before AEDs are made accessible to them.

Bob Adams also had a dramatic experience that I also would like to share, Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues. This occurred on July 3, 1997. Bob Adams was walking through Grand Central Station in New York City when his heart suddenly stopped and he collapsed. He was 42 years old, a lawyer in a firm of 450 people, a husband, and a father of three young children. He was in perfect health and always had been. From the time he played collegiate basketball at Colgate College up to his current avocation as a NCAA basketball referee, health was a nonissue to him.

Nevertheless, without warning, without any history of heart disease, he went into cardiac arrest the day before a holiday weekend, in a location through which half a million people pass every day.

For Bob, timing was everything. On July 2, the day before he collapsed, the automated external defibrillator that

the Metro North Commuter Railroad had ordered for use in Grand Central Station had arrived and the staff had been trained in its use.

Bob's heart was stopped for approximately 5 minutes while the AED was put in place. It was unpacked from its shipping box and everyone hoped it had come with charged batteries. Thanks to the trained staff at the station and an EMT who happened to be present, his life was saved.

Doctors have never discovered what happened to his heart. It simply stopped. Whatever it was, he and his wife Sue, along with their three children, Kimberly, Ryan and Kyle, are very glad there was an AED at Grand Central Station.

Please join with me in cosponsoring H.R. 2498, the Cardiac Arrest Survival Act, and help save lives.

TWO FLOODS AND YOU ARE OUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI.) Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the goal of livable communities is to make our families safe, healthy, and economically secure. Witnessing the devastation that has occurred this last week in the southeastern United States is painful to watch. Thirty-five known dead; others still unaccounted for. Imagine the suffering and disruption of lives and business. It has shown us once again how vulnerable millions of Americans are to natural disaster. The worst floods in years, unforgettable images of disaster, entire families wiped out. We need to help those who are suffering now, but we also need to take steps to prevent suffering like this in the future because it will happen again.

Hurricane experts suggest we are emerging from a relatively calm weather period to a more active destructive one. Increasing development pressures are resulting in building homes in flood plains around rivers, lakes, and on our coasts. One does not have to believe in global warming to know we have a problem, and it is getting worse.

We have to begin to deal with this in a sensible fashion. We need to look at where we build on coasts and developments in wetlands. We need to look at how we build. Even now there is a battle raging in North Carolina, ironically, about their building codes, arguing over, for instance, whether there should be protections for windows—like storm shutters.

When we have already built, we need to look at how we can best protect property and lives from the devastating impact of natural disaster. Government, in fact, bears some responsibility for allowing and indeed fa-

cilitating homes in harm's way by subsidizing repeated flood losses through the National Flood Insurance Program.

Along with the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), I have proposed legislation to provide significant new assistance for those who are most at risk to provide \$400 million additional from the years 2001 to 2004 to help flood-proof or relocate people who are facing the greatest risk from repetitive flood loss, the people most in harm's way.

If an offer of mitigation or relocation would be refused under our proposal, then at least the residents who decide to stay in harm's way would be at least required to pay the full cost of their flood insurance, as those who already live in homes that were built or substantially improved starting in 1975 already do. The intent here is not to punish but is to take away the incentive that people are given by the Federal Government to continue to live in hazardous circumstances.

The bill's name, Two Floods and You Are Out—of the Taxpayers' Pocket, might be a bit provocative but the issue goes far beyond money. The goal of the two floods bill is not to eliminate the flood insurance but, rather, the goal is to protect the lives of Americans who live in the path of frequent flooding, to protect the flood insurance program for the 4 million current policyholders, and to protect the American taxpayer.

The flood insurance program cannot continue as it is now. There is a deficit right at this moment of almost three-quarters of a billion dollars and it is climbing. Two percent of the policyholders have claimed 40 percent of all flood insurance payments since 1978. Many of them have chosen to live, sadly, in these areas of greatest conflict.

There is a home in Texas that has received over \$806,000 of flood insurance in 16 different events in less than 20 years, and the home is worth only \$114,000.

The question then becomes, should the Federal Government be in the business of providing an incentive for a small number of people to stop and continuously risk not just their property but their lives and those of their families and their neighbors.

Nicholas Sparks in this Sunday's New York Times Magazine suggests that, well, maybe the answer is yes. He plans to rebuild in a hurricane devastated sand dune on the Carolina coast.

I think that the majority of Americans would disagree. If there is a compassionate way to provide an incentive for people to move out of harm's way, that is what we should consider. If there is a way to provide that incentive while also protecting the flood insurance program and the American taxpayer, then that approach should be implemented as soon as possible.